AF

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/930,335	08/15/2001	Graham Paul Matthews	4-30811A/C1	1679

1095 7590 03/07/2006

NOVARTIS
CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ONE HEALTH PLAZA 104/3
EAST HANOVER, NJ 07936-1080

EXAMINER	
KWON, BRIAN YONG S	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1614	

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/930,335	MATTHEWS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian S. Kwon	1614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12/13/05*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *9-13* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *10,12 and 13* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *9 and 11* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Application

1. Acknowledgement is made of applicants' filing of the instant application as a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.1114. Claims 9 and 11 are currently pending for prosecution on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claim 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weder et al. (EP 0733372 A2 or its English equivalent to US 5726164).

Weder teaches a composition comprising N-benzoyl-staurosporin, a hydrophilic component (e.g., ethanol and water), surfactant such as polyoxyethylene/polyoxypropylene block copolymer (e.g., Pluronic F68 and Lutrol F68), lipophilic component such as phospholipids, in particular purified lecithin from soybeans (e.g., LIPOID S 100), and additives (e.g., glycerol and sorbitol), wherein said composition produces a suspension of colloidal nanoparticles (abstract; column 2, line 60 thru column 6, line 8; column 7, lines 40-42; Examples 1-3).

The teaching of Weder differs from the claimed invention in (i) the specific amounts active and inactive ingredients (claim 9) and (ii) "bioavailability levels of N-benzoylstaurosporine of from 5 to 17%", "AUC...of from 380 to 2000", and "Cmax...of from 60 to 310" (claim 11). However, those of ordinary skill in the art would have readily optimized effective dosages as determined by good medical practice and the clinical condition of the individual patient. Regardless of the manner of administration, the specific dose or dosage having the desired bioavailability, AUC, and Cmax of the active ingredient may be calculated according to body weight, body surface area or organ size. Further refinement of the calculations necessary to determine the appropriate dosage or the appropriate pharmacokinetic of N-enzoylstaurosporine for treatment involving each of the above mentioned formulations is routinely made by those of ordinary skill in the art and is within the ability of tasks routinely

performed by them without undue experimentation, especially in light of the dosage information disclosed herein

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed December 13, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument in the response takes the position that one skilled in the art would not accept the teachings of Weder. The Applicant alleges that there is no suggestion that one could gain from the teaching of an injectable form, such as that of Weder et al., that would lead one to design an oral form, such as that of the Applicant's invention.

This argument is found unpersuasive. Although the Weder generally discloses the preparation of the staurosporin derivative (i.e., N-benzoyl-staurosporin) in intravenous injectable formulation, the Weder acknowledges that there exist general art accepted knowledge in preparing the staurosporin derivative in oral dosage forms (see column line 44 thru column 2, line 9). In fact, the oral dosage forms containing said staurosporin derivative were well known at the time of the invention was made (see EP 657164 A1 or US 5736542). Furthermore, all the secondary ingredients employed (i.e., hydrophilic component, lipophilic component and surfacts) herein are known to be useful as formulation base that is suitable for intravenous dosage forms and oral dosage forms. Thus, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made would have known that said staurosporon derivative (i.e., N-benzoyl-staurosporin) would be formulated into various dosage forms including oral or intravenous depending upon the convenience of the patients and clinical practitioners.

As discussed above, the claimed N-benzoyl-staurosporine formulation would have been apparent to those skilled in the art. Applicant's mere statement of "surprising success showing the present invention" cannot be considered as an overcoming evidence for this 35 USC 103 obviousness rejection.

Conclusion

4. No Claim is allowed.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Kwon whose telephone number is (571) 272-0581. The examiner can normally be reached Tuesday through Friday from 9:00 am to 7:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low, can be reached on (571) 272-0951. The fax number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Brian Kwon
Patent Examiner
AU 1614